

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
SPRINGFIELD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
HELD MONDAY, MAY 23, 2005

The Springfield Economic Development Agency met for a joint meeting with the Glenwood Renewal Advisory Committee (GRAC) in the Library Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, May 23, 2005 at 7:05 p.m., with Board Chair Tammy Fitch calling the meeting to order.

ATTENDANCE

Springfield Economic Development Agency: Present were Board Chair Tammy Fitch and Board Members Anne Ballew, Sid Leiken, Christine Lundberg, Joe Pishioneri, Dave Ralston, Faye Stewart (7:45pm) and John Woodrow.

Board Member Bill Dwyer was absent (excused).

Glenwood Renewal Advisory Committee: Present were Joan Armstead, Dave Carvo, Jim Peterson, David Seaver and Randy Hledik.

Committee Members Allan Kolb, Steve Roth, John Oldham, and Koren-Joy Sasson were absent.

Also present were Community Development Manager John Tamulonis and City Recorder Amy Sowa.

APPROVAL MINUTES

- a. Minutes of May 9, 2005.

IT WAS MOVED BY BOARD MEMBER WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY BOARD MEMBER BALLEW TO APPROVE THE APRIL 25, 2005 SEDA MINUTES. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 7 FOR AND 0 AGAINST (2 ABSENT – DWYER AND STEWART).

COMMUNICATIONS

- a. Business from the Audience
- b. Correspondence
- c. Business from the Staff

Mr. Tamulonis noted that the Springfield Budget Committee passed the budget as did the SEDA Budget Committee. That budget included the potential loan that could be requested by the SEDA Board from the City of Springfield sometime in the next few weeks. Neither the City Council nor the SEDA Board had adopted that budget at this time.

REPORT OF CHAIR

Board Chair Fitch said it would be a good idea to have another joint meeting either before or after the council's December recess to see how things were going, how the budget would go into affect once approved, and what the opportunities were.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

a. Joint Discussion of SEDA Board and Glenwood Advisory Renewal Advisory Committee.

Mr. Tamulonis presented the staff report on this item. The SEDA board asked the Glenwood Renewal Advisory Committee (GRAC) to provide their perspectives, recommendations, and priorities regarding the residential issues the committee members see as important to residential development and redevelopment in the first few years for the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan. The GRAC members have a broad range of interests and issues but suggest starting with smaller projects and programs and build on them over time to get closer to sorting out some of the more difficult issues (like intersections and right-of-way) needed for larger projects.

Mr. Tamulonis referred to Attachment 1 and 2 included in the agenda packet. He said the interest from the GRAC was to look at some short-term projects, such as a multi-use path that could be used as a bike path that would extend along 14th Street to Glenwood Boulevard. He said cost estimates for that project were still not known. Another project under consideration was to set up some housing programs. The GRAC felt that the programs already in place through the city were good programs and wanted to look into the possibility of transferring those programs into the Urban Renewal District in Glenwood.

Board Member Lundberg asked if the county's CDBG Funds were available and if the homes were county eligible.

Mr. Tamulonis further discussed the housing programs the GRAC had considered and the issue of cost for staffing those programs. He said there were two manufactured home parks that would be eligible for the city's block grant programs. The majority of the manufactured homes in Glenwood would not be eligible without SEDA paying a portion of that bill. The county had limited funding for this type of project. He said he had only heard of one project that the county paid for from their CDBG funds in Glenwood since Springfield had jurisdiction. That was an emergency project and involved about \$5000 in funding. He said the county did not usually set up programs like the one in Springfield. He said there were state funds available for the First Time Homebuyers Program that the city administers that could be eligible for a few projects in Glenwood. He said he was not sure of the amount available, but would most likely allow them to assist with two or three loans. He said the GRAC was looking at trying to get existing renters in homes and converting them to homeowners. The program could be narrowed down to assist with that transition.

Mr. Carvo said they had a number of residents who had rented for years and were part of the neighborhood. This could be a viable way to convert them to owner occupied.

Mr. Tamulonis said that would be different from the other two programs that were operated through block grants and state funding.

Mayor Leiken asked if NEDCO and other groups could be involved in this type of program.

Mr. Tamulonis said it may be possible to work with other organizations on this type of program, but funding would still be needed. GRAC was looking at what programs they were interested in, the size of the programs and the cost of the programs.

Board Member Ralston said if there was potential it would be through the Housing Policy Board. It would be good to encourage them to look at doing something in Glenwood.

Board Member Lundberg said the city's CDBG funds were limited to city property and that was why she had mentioned the county CDBG funds.

Mr. Tamulonis said the county had focused their funds outside the urban growth boundary (UGB) rather than in unincorporated areas inside the UGB.

Mr. Peterson asked if the main goal would be to incorporate Glenwood into Springfield.

Mr. Tamulonis said it was the goal for the future.

Mr. Peterson said these housing programs would make that a lot easier because there was currently a lot of distrust of the city by Glenwood residents.

Mr. Tamulonis said the last project on the list discussed by GRAC was to add striping for a crossing on the McVay Highway. One of the GRAC members had noted that a number of residents cross this road and crossing areas would increase safety. Mr. Tamulonis said those and other issues had been discussed by the GRAC. They would also like to look at commercial and industrial success in Glenwood. Sidewalks along Franklin would be discussed by the city's transportation staff during the summer. GRAC had also discussed alternative street standards in the residential housing area of Glenwood. There were limited numbers of places to access some of those neighborhood.

Mr. Peterson said his degree was in forestry and he had written essays on environmental issues for nearly thirty years. He distributed copies of some of the values of an urban forest. He would like the SEDA Board to take them and review them on their own time. He said Glenwood had a tremendous urban forest and as development occurred, the residents of Glenwood would not want to see the urban forest disrupted too much.

Board Member Pishioneri referred to Attachment 2, page 2, section 1 of item B. He read the part of that section which stated "Loans would be repaid interest free to fund if owner not occupying the residence or if sold or renting to others". He asked what would happen if it was occupied by the owner. He asked if it was a loan.

Mr. Tamulonis said it was an uncalled loan while owner occupied.

Mr. Carvo said GRAC looked at current city programs that could be used in the urban renewal area. These were programs the city already had in place.

Mr. Tamulonis said it was formerly called the Deferred Payment Loan (DPL). It was an obligation on the structure until it changed hands. He said the current program was related to current income level. Some programs were targeted at low income Springfield residents.

Board Member Lundberg said it was a useful tool to allow people to buy a home when they may not otherwise have that opportunity. She explained.

Mr. Tamulonis said the city had about 250 of these loans still outstanding. Once the loan was paid back, it came back into the same fund to be reused for other loans. He said it would show up on a title search.

Board Member Ralston asked what would happen if a loan of this type was still in place when the urban district term ended.

Mr. Tamulonis said there were ways that could be structured. At the end of the urban renewal district, the SEDA Board could designate where the funds from final payment on any outstanding loans would go, such as the city. The entity that was designated would continue the program.

Board Member Ralston said he would be comfortable doing it that way. The property owner could also refinance.

Board Member Ballew suggested there be a minimal amount of interest charged like on the home improvement program.

Board Member Leiken said this was a way to help someone build equity into their home and offered an opportunity. He said he didn't want the interest rate to deter some from being able to buy their home.

Mr. Carvo said the GRAC was charged to come up with quick ideas to build up the housing stock in Glenwood with little money and Mr. Tamulonis presented them with these programs that the city already had in existence. He said he would take personal offense being charged interest when city residents were not. He said he didn't want people to see a double standard in Glenwood. Any investment in Glenwood by SEDA would raise property value, which would mean more taxes back to SEDA.

Board Member Lundberg said she did not want two sets of rules. She had advocated as councilor for equal treatment for the SHOP program regarding residency. She would recommend equity.

Board Member Pishioneri said he agreed that it needed to be the same with the city and Glenwood. If a change was to be made, it would need to be made across the board. The standard must be the same in the city and in Glenwood.

Board Member Woodrow asked where the money for this program came from.

Mr. Tamulonis said it would come from tax increment financing and the loan from the city for those programs administered by SEDA. The CDBG funds came from the federal government, but those funds must go to the city.

Board Member Woodrow said he agreed it needed to be the same in the city and in Glenwood. He discussed the intent of the program.

Ms. Armstead said she had ideas about recovering the money more quickly. As a Glenwood resident she didn't like to see trashy yards. She discussed linking the condition of the property to the loan and possibly raising the loan payment to match the owner's income.

Mr. Peterson said he would not agree to tying the condition of the property to the loan.

Board Member Ballew said there were a lot of good ideas, but asked to move forward with the agenda.

Board Chair Fitch said there was enthusiasm. She asked about the budget and if there was a line item for this type of thing.

Mr. Tamulonis said there was a line item for projects.

Board Chair Fitch said it would be good to ask the attorney to review some of the suggestions. She said it would be beneficial to bring back a proposal at the next joint meeting in the fall for a program to put into place.

Board Member Lundberg said the CDBG program was based on federal requirements. If SEDA was replicating that, the same regulations needed to be the same. Research needed to be done regarding those regulations and requirements.

Mr. Tamulonis said it might be useful for the GRAC to meet with the CDBG Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) to discuss these issues. He said Housing Program Assistant Jodi Peterson had attended one of the GRAC meetings to describe the programs.

Mr. Carvo said Ms. Peterson gave good information about the programs. GRAC was just looking at starting the same thing with a different agency handling the program. It needed to be determined when these types of programs could be started. They did not need to be started immediately. He said extra meetings may not be needed.

Board Chair Fitch said SEDA would have to contract with city, so the closer the programs were set to match the city's programs the better. The difference would be the reporting which would be done to SEDA rather than the federal government. GRAC could look at what would qualify. She gave some examples.

Mr. Tamulonis said the agreement between the city and SEDA needed to be appropriate for that. He discussed the legal implications and costs regarding lead paint and other issues.

Board Chair Fitch said it would be something that would need extensive research and may not be started for eight to ten months.

Board Member Stewart arrived (7:45pm).

Mr. Peterson asked if the board members had pressing issues for GRAC to discuss.

Board Member Leiken said industrial property needed to be addressed. He said the county had an opportunity to leverage with the road funds within much of the industrial property in Glenwood. Over the years, a small amount of road funds had been able to leverage large amounts of private investment and job creating opportunities. He said there was some good, solid industrial property in Glenwood.

Mr. Carvo said the biggest issue for any type of development was sewer and water to the area. Without that, there were limitations on what could be done with the property. The existing pump system was working, but the gravity fed line would open that area up to more uses.

Board Chair Fitch said there was a lot of developable property including the urban village, industrial and office space. She said it was important not to forget the residential part of Glenwood and the neighborhoods. She said it would be important for the GRAC to perfect those programs and bringing back those neighborhoods. She didn't want them left behind. She said the bike path might be one way to assist those neighborhoods.

Mr. Peterson said the core neighborhood of Glenwood had been discussed frequently in the GRAC meetings.

Mr. Carvo said there was now a Glenwood Neighborhood Committee and paperwork would be submitted to the city and the county. The formation of that committee would allow better exchange of information and ideas.

Mr. Peterson said the Neighborhood Committee would be instrumental in cleaning up the area.

Mr. Carvo said thanks to the county, they had already done a great job.

Board Member Lundberg asked GRAC about the strategies.

Mr. Peterson said GRAC had gone through this list every meeting.

Mr. Carvo said he would like to see laterals in neighborhoods to push the annexation issue.

Board Chair Fitch said as a councilor, she had not wanted to force annexation. It was best to be approached by someone interested in annexing. She would prefer not to force annexation as that had been a big concern of Glenwood residents. She said perhaps GRAC could check with people that might be interested in annexing in and look at putting in laterals.

Board Member Lundberg said the city had assisted with laterals for a lot of homes with the Bancroft Program, allowing the homeowner to pay over time. She suggested GRAC look at whether or not that could be added to a housing program list.

Board Member Ballew said GRAC was from the community of Glenwood and had a great advantage. She said it would be best to have a block of streets that might want to come together to annex.

Mr. Peterson said the projects they had discussed would cost nearly \$5M.

Board Chair Fitch said that was why the district would last twenty years.

Ms. Armstead said her feeling from Glenwood residents was that they were not ready to annex to the city yet. She said GRAC had not finished going through the project list and strategies. She felt some things were not mentioned that she wanted to include. She mentioned some of those things such as: using pervious surfaces, keeping the bioswale going, and putting power lines underground in new developments. She said it was not only what the residents wanted, but what would attract new development. She said there were people on GRAC from the residential and from the commercial and they wanted to address the needs in both areas. She said she liked the possibility of getting the industrial areas ready. That, along with nodal development, would create an atmosphere that would continue to have quality in Glenwood.

Board Member Stewart said it was important to take advantage of current opportunities such as Williams Bakery to capitalize and improve other things. He said it was a huge project and would not happen fast. It was important that the moves made would be done in the best interest of Glenwood. He said the make-up of GRAC was very diverse and offered a great perception of Glenwood because the members lived and worked in the area. He said it was good to hear their concerns and ideas. He said it was important to make sure those that were headed to Glenwood could get there. He discussed street improvements and sanitation, noting that those things would generate improvements that would bring people to Glenwood. He said SEDA needed to be thoughtful of how it was done.

Mr. Carvo said it would be nice if SEDA could ask the City Council to have staff work with Glenwood residents on some of the development codes, tree felling codes and street width codes. He said that would make it easier for them to know what could or couldn't change visually.

Mr. Hledik said GRAC had looked at residential first. He said the common denominator for this committee was the Glenwood Refinement Plan which recognized the importance of the character and identity of the residential area in Glenwood plus the opportunities the industrial vacant land had for Glenwood and Springfield. He said improving the Franklin Boulevard and McVay Highway corridor was of great importance as the gateway into Springfield from I-5. He said there was some great potential there.

Board Chair Fitch said this was a good meeting. The next joint meeting would be scheduled for November or January depending on future meeting schedules. GRAC could share which projects they would like to move forward, with proposals for some of those programs and how to allocate the funds.

RESOLUTIONS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Christine Lundberg
Secretary